THEOLOGY

VOL. LIX JULY, 1956 No. 433

Shears in the Vineyard

To tidy up the Church of England is a project which has fascinated many. This was the real motive behind the attempt to revise the Prayer Book in the 1920s, and as little good has come out of it as might have been expected. It was not likely that a glorious liturgy would be the by-product of such an intention, and few of the insipidities of the time are, in fact, missing from between the covers of the resulting book. This is the tragedy of the architects of tidiness, where they are inconvenienced by so obstreperous a body as the Church of England, that they reduce what is tidied to the mediocrity which is all that they can entice the exuberant into agreeing upon. But that is well enough, when exuberance is seen, not as a virtue, but as a nuisance. Better a tame house sparrow than an undisciplined eagle.

That is one form of the cult of tidiness. There is another, which demands that the Gospel shall be rescued from the deplorable confusion of Holy Scripture, and presented with such precision that all, save those who think at all, will readily accept it. Though this is to be done in the interests of what is called evangelism, whispers may also be heard of the fear that slicker bodies will steal a march upon the Church of England. But first there is the hatred of loose ends which would reduce the Church of England to a diagram. This is for a Church, which the providence of God has in the best Bible manner brought out of a history that cannot be rationalized, a kind of apostasy. It is to draw back from the costly (because disadvantageous) vocation, to which that history points, of accepting God's handling as justification.

The Church of England, as it at present exists, is outstandingly a product of the untamable history in which biblical faith sees the moulding, shaping, smiting hand of the Lord God. Every institution, human and divine (and the Church is both), is in great measure a product of that history, but the Church of England has no other account of itself to give. Here is no Luther, no model Geneva, no Council of Trent. Those who like the 17th-century divines of the Church of England, and they are very likeable, are fond of describing their time as the formative period. Nobody who remembers the average Sunday congregation, a body of people whom the theorists are prone to forget, can be satisfied by so limited a notion. Tory squires, Whig bishops, 19th-century men of substance and of valour, notably the Duke of Wellington, have made a mark at least as indelible as Andrewes and Taylor. A host of influences, many of them political, a host of people, many of them far from prepossessing, a host of movements and events, as many of them secular as ecclesiastical, have at a host of times gone to make the Church of England

what it is. It has taken history, and a particular history, the history of England, into its veins.

The important thing about this is not that it has made the Church of England frightfully English. That may be a good thing to be. To look for the consummation of all things, including nations, does not involve one in the dreariness of cosmopolitanism. But the point here is that all history, which is made up of particular histories, is God's history. It is all his melting pot and out of that melting pot the Church of England has come. Thus there is no theory of the Church of England. If there ever was one, it has been rendered largely irrelevant by later developments—the Act of Toleration, for instance. This again is thoroughly biblical, for the Bible is not interested in theories, but in a world in which there must be a theory of everything it is a difficult and daunting position to maintain. That is why the history itself is turned into a nice straightforward story by the propagandists. The Reformation was as simple as that. Such conscious or naive trifling with complex truth is, of course, very far from being peculiar to propagandists of the Church of England, but the Church of England, did it realize its vocation to reflect in its life those depths which now we see "in a glass darkly", ought to have no need of special pleading.

Take Anne Boleyn. Doubtless a variety of factors—dynastic, economic, concupiscent, religious—combined to set the English Reformation off on its long journey, and nobody, who has at all sensed the oddness of the human heart, will be eager to disentangle and grade them. Sooner or later the unwillingness of the new business men to buy soldiers, secretaries, and statues for amoral Popes might have caused no less an upheaval. Yet Anne played her part and one may believe that at times it was a dominant part. The calculations of a bold, clever, engaging, passionless climber acting upon the susceptibilities and medieval superstition of a full-blooded, tantalized opportunist, influenced the timing of things. This is important, for that changes so drastic took place under the hand of one temperamentally so conservative as Henry, has permanently affected the character of the Church that was thus reformed, and not, most of its present adherents would think, affected it for ill. The *carte blanche* men with their systems and confessions were kept at arm's length on the Continent at a crucial time. But it is not a pretty story. What then? To say that without Anne Boleyn there could have been no Mrs Sumner and the Mothers' Union would be to exaggerate, yet so strange are the courses of history that the two ladies, the one so scandalous and the other so worthy, have to be fitted into the same genealogy. But so has Jacob. Was ever such a cad? Yet from his loins sprang salvation, and by appointment. It is far more likely that a further movement of the Spirit will flow from an equally strange, and possibly outrageous, source than that it will be generated in the committee room, the conference, the stadium.

To tidy up what has been born of God's inscrutable dealings with his people, ever since he called Abraham from Ur, and the Church of England bears the weird birth-marks that betoken such an origin,

is inevitably to reduce its stature, but the process is apt to be regarded with equanimity, because the Church of England has commonly been presented by its apologists as so altogether less exciting a thing than it is. It is said to walk along the middle way. Moderation is named as its outstanding characteristic. Nobody but a fool is going to despise moderation, but moderation, turned into a watchword, is a quenching virtue, and to regard it as a kind of classical characteristic of the Church of England is happily sheer caricature. Moderation is not always a word that springs to mind, when one thinks of the significant names and movements in English Church history. Even the great Latitudinarians were not moderately broad. They were very broad indeed. The statesmanship that merely manipulates, rationalizes, risks not, is forgotten in its uncreativeness, admired though it was, and important though it was thought, in its own day. This is not to say that the Church of England has been a Church of wild men, though it has had its wild men, and they have enriched it. But neither has it been a Church of nondescripts. Doctrines so diverse as the Divine Right of Kings, the reasonableness of virtue, and the merits of medieval Sarum have been proclaimed with fruitful extravagance. We worship amid the enthusiasms of the Royal Arms, the panegyric epitaph, the riddel posts with their inevitable gilded angels, and none of them is a mere relic.

Nor would a visitor to a present-day Ruridecanal Chapter be apt to go away, proclaiming as his chief impression, "How moderate they are!" Very probably they will have gone at it hammer and tongs. Yet they are not a mob. This is the marvel that God has wrought in the Church of England, and to speak of it as a compromise Church is altogether to underestimate it. All the paradoxes, all the tensions, that are in the Bible are active in its life, and the waning of partisanship has not abolished them, but only rendered them more healthy and less stereotyped. The Bible is a tension book. The Church of England is a tension Church. Neither deals in syntheses, which are invariably heretical. The Church of England preacher, who knows his business, will on the one Sunday be preaching *sola fide*, and on the next dangling the prize of glory before those whom he is urging so to run that they may obtain. But for the most part the tensions are maintained by rival voices. The great days, when heads were split open in public houses over such questions as justification, are, alas, in a distant past, but there is still a Church in the land which does not think that the truth can be reduced to syllogisms, and proclaims its abhorrence of systems boldly in its life. For a Bible Church will not only base its teaching on Scripture, refusing to include among what must be believed such new-fangled doctrines as Christ's apostles never heard of. It will reflect in its life and temper and very construction those deep depths into which God by his revelation of himself, recorded in the Bible, allows us to look. "My thoughts are not your thoughts neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord."

It is not only those who fondly hope that one day the whole Church of England will be "High", or the whole of it "Low", or the whole of it breathlessly chasing the latest fashions of thought, who are to be

heard deploring their splendid inheritance. The same frame of mind that would turn the House of Commons into an imitation of one of those polite 18th-century battles, in which generals raised cocked hats and cried to one another, "You shoot first", is to be found in the Church. If utter peace may not prevail, as in some totalitarian cemetery of the living, let the naughtiness of disturbing persons be carefully checked and regulated. If there may not be another Act of Uniformity, and seldom can a piece of legislation have been dealt with more strangely by the wind that "bloweth where it listeth", at the least let there be means of harassing experiment and cabining adventure.

But here the other demand for tidiness makes its voice to be heard. The decent agnosticism, which is the first evidence of creatureliness and awe, is dubbed weak. If the Church may not stand before the Lord God, knowing all the answers, let it at all costs stand before the public so. Even in the Church of England, which has prided itself on its integrity, the argument may now be heard that to distort the truth does not matter, so long as what is distorted is clarified. What is not simple must be made simple for the sake of those who are somewhat arrogantly called the simple. Oddly enough, it is not from those who are called simple that the demand comes. Often the simple still have in them the poetry which is one of the ingredients of any profoundness. It is the over-intellectualized, who are supposing that their neighbours must have lost every trace of child-likeness too, that make this demand. Circles which are now reacting against an academic liberalism find it difficult to realize that those who never participated in it, nor became literal-minded through it, do not want the Prayer Book rendered into basic English, nor the faith to which it gives expression in worship reduced to truisms. Nor is it they who are falling for infallible voices or infallible books. Significantly it is among students that ill-based means of supposed certainty seem to be most enthusiastically accepted.

But certainly the reaction has come. It is the day of oracles. Concrete standing-places must be provided for all, however great a morass of unreason lies beneath them. A host of monopolists of the truth runs around proclaiming half-truths, and sometimes untruths, and this is their hour. It is a frightening situation for the Church of England. A humble, unstrident, unstreamlined Church finds itself against the tide. Neighbours announce their successes with fanfares of statistics. Its own people will be impressed by them. Cannot the Church of England put out the truth in twelve lessons too? Cannot the Church of England put up orators to score Bible bull's-eyes with every smacking shot? Cannot the Church of England say that this is pure black and that pure white? Grey is such a troublesome colour. The danger is that, as the tide advances—and such a Church may well find itself up to the neck in it—the Church of England will be rattled into forsaking one of the tasks for which God has raised it up—to witness by its very refusals, and this is not a negative but a positive undertaking, to the majesty of the truth that defies our systems.

That is why everything that is done in the name of the great goddess, Simplicity, must be scrutinized. Is it merely slick? Is it achieving that result by omitting the real content of the Gospel? To be "in Christ", for instance, is for our generation as difficult an idea as the Bible contains, but it is of the very essence of the matter. Sooner or later, unless watch is kept, we shall only be baptized into the Church, such is the passion for simple Baptism Services, and not into Christ at all. But not only are watch dogs needed. The Church of England has a case to present and, in presenting it, a witness to give, and one that was never more needed than at this time. Here, like all Reformed Churches, it is in a difficulty. It may not glory before God. It may not glory "save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ". It knows that it is not the Kingdom, even though it does too often pray as though its own extension were an extension of the Kingdom which Paul did not extend but "preach". Yet the Church of England is in great need of explaining itself, not only to the world, but to its own people. It has had its great men and women, and the fact that it does not canonize them is no reason why nobody should ever hear about them. Many of them were scholars and thinkers, and the Church of England believes in both scholarship and thinking. So, for all the temper of the times, do many people to-day and they are ready to respect them.

What a tragedy, what an act of faithlessness, should the Church of England at a challenging moment be daunted by the possibility of sacrificial loss, and fail to find its life by losing it! What is called definiteness will pay, for that is the fashion and it may be the fashion for a long time to come, but there can be definiteness which is nothing but a perversion of the truth as God has revealed it in the mystery of his Son. Again, planned efficiency will pay. Authoritarian planning is the fashion. The amateur, the eccentric, the rebel against the commonplace is not esteemed. Yet God has made the Church of England by tradition a great place, and sometimes a refuge, for them. How largely he has made it what it is through them! May he forbid that this part of his vineyard shall be turned into a topiary garden, among the trim bushes of which yet further committees meet to plan yet further improvements!

FRANK BENNETT.

Archbishop Davidson and the Church

RANDALL DAVIDSON died on 25th May 1930 at the age of eighty-two. More than twenty-five years have therefore passed since his death; and, although it is still too soon to assess his stature or his influence on the history of the Church, it is time to look back on his career and his policy, and to see what he stood for and what his policy was.

This monumental figure, who occupied the see of Canterbury for twenty-five eventful years, rose to the top of the ecclesiastical tree with a rapidity that is startling. Brought up a Presbyterian, he did not begin to take much interest in the Church of England until he was grown up, though at Harrow he was confirmed in the normal

course of events at the age of seventeen. At Oxford, however, he was brought face to face with the Church of England in the form and figure of Craufurd Tait, the beloved only son of the ageing Archbishop of Canterbury. This friendship was the turning-point in Davidson's life. It introduced him to the circle of Lambeth and Canterbury, and caused him to look on the Anglican Church with new eyes. He immediately found it enormously attractive; and from this point he turned his back upon Scotland and Presbyterianism for good. For the rest of his life Scotland, his native land, became (as for so many of his fellow-countrymen) just a place for holidays. Davidson now made England his home, and not only England but the Home Counties; for when, in 1883, only eight years after his ordination as priest, he was offered what might be considered one of the "plums" of the Church—a residentiary canonry at Durham—he refused it on the grounds that "his real work and interests belonged to the South".[1] He had, therefore, very quickly made up his mind where he wanted to be and what he wanted to do. He wished, as quickly as possible, to take his place in the circle of those most immersed in ecclesiastical and political life at the centre. He wasted no time. Ordained deacon in the diocese of Canterbury by Archbishop Tait at the age of twenty-six, he took steps in the very next year to get his name put down for membership of the Athenaeum.[2] After three years as assistant curate of Dartford he was, through his friendship with Craufurd Tait, taken into the Archbishop's family as residential chaplain. By the time he was thirty-four he had been offered, and had refused, the important livings of Maidstone and Croydon and residentiary canonries at Canterbury and Durham. He accepted, however, the position of examining chaplain to the Bishop of Durham (Lightfoot), and, more important, that of sub-almoner to the Queen. Thus at the age when most young clergymen are engaged in house-to-house visiting, running boys' clubs, organizing Sunday School treats and preparing innumerable sermons, Davidson was busy building up for himself a position in the inner councils of both Church and State; and, from this point onwards, no important appointment in the Church was made without his advice being sought.

The way to the primacy was now clearly marked out. Promotion was only a matter of time, and it came just as and when it was wanted. In 1883, at the age of thirty-five, he became Dean of Windsor and personal adviser to the Queen. In 1891 he was made Bishop of Rochester, translated to Winchester in 1895 and finally moved to Canterbury in 1903 at the age of fifty-five. No wonder that the shrewd old Queen could write of him, "The Queen wonders if the Dean is at all an ambitious man."[3] She need hardly have wondered, for ambitious he certainly was—not for wealth or honour (for he was a very humble man), but for power and influence. He wanted to be in a position where he could control appointments and policies in the Church and, if possible, in the State. He wanted to be the man to whom the Queen, the Prime Minister, and others in positions of

[1] G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson*, p. 62.
[2] Ibid., p. 159. He was not actually elected until 1890.
[3] Ibid., p. 185.

great responsibility would naturally turn for advice. He wanted to equip himself in such a way that he would eventually become almost indispensable, the most influential person in the land.

His qualifications were many. He had a powerful mind which was capable of grasping a number of difficult problems and seeing its way towards a solution of each. He was immensely industrious; unfailing in courtesy and patience; courageous in all his acts and words. He was also extremely determined, so much so that Dean Church once exclaimed, "Master Davidson mustn't fancy that he can always get his own way."[1] But he generally did; for in addition to this determination was his immense confidence in himself which came to him early and remained with him all through his life. At the age of thirty-seven he expected drafts of important letters from Lambeth to be sent to him for his approval, and returned one to Archbishop Benson with a note saying, "The suggested manifesto is *not* what I had myself anticipated or desired,"[2] while of the Bishop of Southwell, George Ridding, who had earned his disapproval, he wrote, "I think he wants his ears boxed."[3] Whether as curate, chaplain, dean or bishop, Davidson always had the utmost confidence in himself. He matured very early, and in the thirties was behaving and speaking with the sense of authority which to most men comes only after many years of experience.

Such were the characteristics and qualities which Davidson brought first to Windsor, and then to Rochester, Winchester and Canterbury. Entering upon the primacy in 1903 at the age of fifty-five, he had many years to look forward to—years full of interest, excitement and drama. But any who thought that a young archbishop[4] would bring new ideas, new inspiration, originality, or imagination to the Church were bound to be disappointed. Davidson had no such gifts. All his strength lay the other way—to control, to hold back, to steady the boat, to make people think and think again before making any rash move. "We must proceed with great caution", "the utmost caution is necessary"—the phrases are repeated again and again in his correspondence. It is, consequently, almost impossible to see any policy in his work except a negative one; and this arises from the view which he held as to the nature and function of the Church.

It is important to realize that Davidson had not had much church teaching in his youth. He was the last of a long line of Presbyterians, and his introduction to church life was straight into the world of administration and high ecclesiastical politics. Apart from three years as curate of Dartford he had never rubbed shoulders with the working clergy of the Church of England, and, as a result of this, his conception of the true work of the Church was a very limited one. It had never been thought out theologically, and was, in fact, concerned more with the well-being of the nation than with the progress of the Kingdom of God. The Church was, to him, one of several elements in the life of the nation. He had a profound faith in England and her

[1] *Randall Davidson*, p. 133. [2] Ibid., p. 104. [3] Ibid., p. 105.
[4] Except for Benson who was 54, Davidson was the youngest archbishop of Canterbury since 1747.

people, and regarded the Church of England as the guardian of all that was best in the national life. This idea fixed itself in his mind at an early date and remained with him to the end. In 1889, when he was Dean of Windsor, he wrote a letter to *The Times* in which he spoke of "the great central body of the Church" whose work was "the *social, moral and religious progress of the people of England*".[1] Thirty-eight years later, in his speech on the Revised Prayer Book in the House of Lords in 1927 he said, "The Church of England, for which to-night I am spokesman, has a trust immeasurably great and sacred. From the depths of our hearts we want to use it aright. We want to use for *the bettering of English life* every ounce of the strength which, by God's benediction, is ours."[2]

But perhaps the clearest place in which to see Davidson's idea of the Church is in the Charge which he delivered to the diocese of Canterbury in 1912 and subsequently published under the title of *The Character and Call of the Church of England*. In the first five chapters he deals with the history of the Anglican Church, its place in the world and his own responsibilities as its leader. It is only in the sixth and last that he reveals what he believes to be the essential function of the Church. What is this? The extension of Christ's kingdom in the hearts of men? The proclamation of the good news of man's redemption? The bringing of souls to Christ? The greater glory of God expressed in prayer and praise? It is, apparently, none of these things. "What the Church stands for, fights for, prays for, toils for," he says, "is *an elementarily straight, strong, pure, moral life,* to be lived by us all in the things of every day." Of course he goes on to say that "we have no belief in the ordinary attainment of that good daily life by men and women and children save by the help of their religious faith. . . . But while it is in and through the faith of Jesus Christ, and the power of Jesus Christ, that we expect that to become possible, none the less the thing (to use an expressive colloquialism) that we are 'after' in our work, our services, our pastorate as a whole, is *the bettering of the ordinary moral standard of life* in the homes and shops and factories and fields."[3]

Davidson thus saw the Church primarily as a great institution for the moral improvement of the people of England. It was to influence the life of the nation at every point; to keep it clean, and manly, and undefiled; to fight against "what is selfish, or cruel, or cowardly, or impure".[4] He saw (or thought he saw) a weakening of the moral fibre of the nation, and he felt that the greatest work which the Church could do was to stop it.[5]

[1] *Randall Davidson*, p. 137. [2] Ibid., p. 1344.
[3] *The Character and Call of the Church of England* (1912), p. 111.
[4] Ibid., p. 34.
[5] In a Preface to a book called *The Church of the People* Davidson quoted some words of Adam Smith: "Religious instruction is a species of instruction of which the object is not so much to render the people good citizens in this world as to prepare them for another and a better world in the life to come." He adds: "Utterly to eradicate that notion—to 'shrivel the falsehood from the souls of men'—and to supplant it by a truer conception of the gospel of Christ is, as it seems to me, the special office of the Church of England at the present moment in our national life."

There were various ways in which this could be done. The first was by legislation. To Davidson Parliament meant a great deal. He was "a House of Lords man" and never missed an important debate. Parliament, with its adjuncts in the Athenaeum and one or two dining clubs, played a very important part in his life, to the great distress of men like Scott Holland who longed to see the archbishop playing the part of a great Church leader.[1]

Davidson believed strongly in the importance of wise legislation. He believed equally strongly in the importance of administering the existing law of the land. In all the troubles with the Ritualists he fell back again and again on the law. This comes out clearly in the account of the Dolling disaster. Here was a man trying to do in the slums of Portsmouth the very things that Davidson cared most about. But Dolling was a Ritualist who insisted upon doing things which his bishop regarded as illegal. Davidson therefore crushed him. He believed that his job was "to maintain the true Protestant character of the Church of England against foolish innovations".[2] By "foolish innovations" he meant things which he was not accustomed to, or which he thought could be suppressed by law, such as Reservation and the use of incense.[3]

In Davidson's mind there were three kinds of law—civil, Christian and ecclesiastical. The last he regarded as fussy and sacerdotal. This comes out in a letter which he wrote to the Prime Minister's secretary in 1903 on the question of matrimonial legislation. "It is becoming," he said, "almost intolerable that Bishops should be called upon to advise the Clergy to do things which they (the Bishops), not less than the unhappy Parish Priests, believe to be contrary to Christian law."[4] Note here the importance of the word "almost". The sentence can mean only one thing: that though it was unfortunate it was not yet impossible for the bishops to advise their clergy to choose the law of the land rather than the law of Christ. But he goes on to say, "I say 'Christian law' because it is not a fussy or fanciful introduction of Church law or Canon law as contrasted with the laws of England, but fundamental principles." At the same time he showed that what he meant by Canon law was "the rules or customs which a large body of Churchmen believe, whether rightly or wrongly, to be obligatory upon them as laws of the Church".[5]

It is clear, therefore, that Davidson had very little faith in the Church as lawgiver. He was equally uncertain as to the Church's function in education. During his long life he had much to do with the growth and progress of elementary education; and naturally, as Primate, he had to take up the cause of church schools. But he does not seem to have understood fully what church schools were for, or why some people thought them so important; for in a letter to the President of the Board of Education, Augustine Birrell, a keen non-conformist who was known to desire the abolition of church schools altogether, he wrote, "I have no fears at all that the cause for which

[1] Bell, op. cit., p. 406.
[2] Ibid., p. 335.
[3] This is clear from a passage, ibid., pp. 363–5.
[4] Ibid., p. 427.
[5] Ibid., p. 425.

I mainly care (the efficiency of secular teaching combined with genuine and thorough grounding in scriptural knowledge and the broad elements of the Christian religion) will suffer unfairly at your hands."[1] But those who fought to save the church schools in 1906 were fighting for something more than "the broad elements of the Christian religion". They were fighting for the Church's right to teach her children the full Christian faith and life as taught in the Catechism and expressed in worship and prayer. The "cause" for which Davidson "mainly cared" was really the cause of the non-conformists who were quite prepared to impart to the children "scriptural knowledge and the broad elements of the Christian religion".

All this shows where the Archbishop's sympathies lay. He had great faith in the English nation and in the English Church as an element in the life of the people. He regarded his office as "the historic centre of a great constitutional system",[2] a system devised to guide the legislators aright, and to sweeten and strengthen the moral life of the people. This was the fundamental task of the National Church, and in order to do it the Archbishop of Canterbury had an important part to play. Davidson so built up his reputation for wisdom and sound guidance that he became a kind of "elder statesman", almost indispensable at Westminster. He expected to be, and was, consulted by Prime Ministers on matters of policy. He intervened in all kinds of purely political affairs. He thought nothing of walking across Lambeth Bridge and demanding an interview with the Prime Minister himself. But to the real work of the Church he seemed strangely indifferent, so much so that a Serbian bishop said of him in 1921: "His work seems primarily to be Ireland, the House of Lords, and other affairs of a public character which could get on without him. The Archbishop should remember that he stands for the eternal."[3]

"The eternal." What part did this play in his work and in his conception of the Church's nature? How far is it possible to find, under the heavy weight of correspondence on policy in Church and State, a strong firm faith in the Church as the Body of Christ? Writing of the time when he was training for the ministry he said, "I had begun to feel a keen interest in things ecclesiastical, as well as maintaining my old interest in things religious."[4] To some extent this distinction was always present in his mind. Religion was a personal matter between a man and God, and Randall Davidson was a deeply religious man. But in religious, as opposed to ecclesiastical, matters he was not much of a thinker. Theology meant little to him, and he had never devoted much time to it. He believed rather vaguely in what he called "the cause of freedom and wider sympathies",[5] and wished "to assert in practice the thoughtful and deliberate comprehensiveness of the Church of England" by pursuing "an elasticity which I have sought not only to condone but even to encourage in

[1] Bell, op. cit., p. 514.
[2] Ibid., p. 711.
[3] Ibid., p. 1053.
[4] Ibid., p. 29.
[5] Ibid., p. 152.

certain credal matters".[1] He hated dogmatism, which he knew to be disliked by the English laity whose point of view he so often championed.

For nearly sixty years Davidson took an immense interest in the affairs of the Church, but it is doubtful if he ever paused to think what the Church was, or even what message of hope was entrusted to its keeping by Christ. This comes out surprisingly but overwhelmingly in his Charge of 1912. Here he had before him the clergy and leading laity of his diocese for six addresses, and he had chosen as his theme "The Character and Call of the Church of England". Here, one would have thought, would have been an opportunity for a little Christian teaching, and one would have expected the Archbishop to open the Bible and see "what the Spirit saith to the churches". But though it is clear from other sources that Davidson regarded the Bible as the basis of all authority, in these six addresses it is never once invoked or referred to.[2] No attempt is made to show how the Church originated or what place it holds in the teaching of Christ and the apostles, or what part it must play in the divine economy. Nor does he speak of the Church as the sphere in which man finds redemption, or as the vehicle of man's praise and adoration, or as the purveyor of grace through Word and Sacrament. Nor does he seek to find in the words of Christ, or in the teaching of the prophets or apostles, any message to pass on to his clergy and people in the midst of their work.

The reason for all this is that Davidson never thought of the Church in that way at all. To him the Church was primarily the guardian of morality, whether in the House of Lords or in the cottages of the farm labourers; and he makes it the climax of his charge. "We must leave no one in any doubt," he says, "as to our chief purpose and aim, the definite bettering of the moral standard of our common life."[3] To Randall Davidson this was so much the greatest of all causes that other aspects of the Church's work and message seem to have made but a small impression on his mind.

JOHN R. H. MOORMAN.

Towards the Anglican Doctrine of Vocation[4]

WITHIN the Church of England, ordination is the climax of a long period of preparation stretching back in many instances for at least seven years, over a period of National Service, over three years at a university and over two years at a theological college. This is now

[1] Bell, op. cit., pp. 795–7. The elastic was very supple, for in 1925 he wrote, "There are many men who, though nominally Jews, are virtually Christians of a liberal sort, and I have every wish to encourage such" (p. 1202).

[2] Occasionally, though not more than half a dozen times, a biblical phrase is used, but only as a point of style.

[3] *The Character and Call of the Church of England*, p. 117.

[4] Substance of a talk given on the Third Programme of the B.B.C., 29 May 1955.

the accepted line along which vocation to the ministry is tested. It comprises practical, intellectual and spiritual discipline.

The beginnings of this understanding date from the early years of the first Queen Elizabeth. The situation of the clergy which then confronted the bishops was critical. In 1551 Bishop Hooper of Gloucester visited the 311 clergy in his diocese and found that only 50 of them could answer nine such simple questions as:

1. Repeat the Lord's Prayer.
2. How many commandments are there?
3. Repeat the Articles of the Creed.

There were 10 who could not even say the Lord's Prayer.[1]

In the county of Devon, part of the diocese of Exeter, Professor A. L. Rowse reveals that only 24 out of 288 clergy in the year 1560 ever preached a sermon.[2] Dr Purvis, well known for his researches into the history of the diocese of York, has shown that in 1575 there were 142 parishes in the diocese in which there was not a single sermon throughout the whole year.[3] Comparable statistics in other dioceses reveal a similar state of affairs.[4] Few of the clergy ever preached, and the majority were poorly educated. In fact, the crisis facing the Church in the middle of the 16th century was infinitely more acute than that facing it to-day.

It is of the greatest interest, therefore, to consider how the Church faced her problems then and converted, within a century, a body of ill-equipped and uneducated men into the amazement of the world for piety, devotion and learning. The first changes were practical: a stricter (though still not rigidly uniform) observance of the conditions of ordination. There were to be no more clergy enjoying the stipends of their livings in order to study abroad. Testimonials were to be more than a formality.[5] Next, the education of the clergy was considered by the convocations. From 1570 onwards they repeatedly insisted that a university degree was an indispensable preliminary to ordination.[6] As time went on facts began to correspond to ideals: ordinands were normally members of one of the universities.

The measure of this progress in securing a university education for the clergy may be deduced from the following facts. In 1558 there were only 28 who graduated that year at Cambridge.[7] Between 1617 and 1637 an average of 266 graduated every year and of these 207 took Orders.[8] University figures are substantiated by the figures from

[1] Lindsay, T. M., *History of the Reformation*, II, 353 f.
[2] Rowse, A. L. *Tudor Cornwall*, p. 324.
[3] Purvis, J. S., *Tudor Parish Documents*, pp. 96 ff.
[4] See Diary and Correspondence of Pepys, 4 vols, London, 1867, IV, 263 (Diocese of London, 1563). Rowse, A. L., *The England of Elizabeth*, p. 422 (Diocese of Lincoln, 1651–2). Becon, T., *Early Works*, p. 5 (1564).
[5] Frere, W. H., *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation*, III, 88 and 102. Cardwell, E., *Documentary Annals*, I, 289.
[6] Cardwell, E., *Synodalia*, I, 132 ff.
[7] Usher, R. G., *The Reconstruction of the English Church*, I, 25. Venn, J. A., in *Caius College*, p. 23, records that in 1544 only 18 in the whole university had graduated B.A.)
[8] Venn, J. A., op. cit., pp. 94 f.

the dioceses. In the diocese of Norwich 75 per cent. of ordinands between 1603 and 1608 were graduates.[1] In the diocese of Bangor in those days far distant from the universities, there was a predominance of ordinands with degrees.[2]

Learning increased and with it the capacity to preach. Fewer and fewer parishes remained without sermons, so that, to revert to the diocese of York, the number of parishes without sermons during the year shrank from 142 in 1575 to 12 in the year 1594. This was partly due to the increase of learning, but also to the increased attention to the subject of preaching.

Many helps became available for the preacher, one of which was designed primarily for candidates for Holy Orders. Only two copies are now known to exist: one at the British Museum and the other at the Bodleian Library, Oxford.[3] It is entitled *A Preparation to the Most Holie Ministerie: also a livelie exhortation to all youth to give themselves to the study thereof; and a confutation of the objections which may be brought in any sort to touch the same.* The book was originally written in French by Pierre Gérard and translated by Nicholas Becket in 1598. The book is dedicated to his "loving brethren the pastors and ministers of Devon and Cornwall", and Becket held a living in Devon, where, as we have seen, preaching had been particularly rare. The whole purpose of the book is to underline the importance of the preaching ministry.

The work itself is divided into two parts. It begins by lamenting the conditions of the day and goes on to affirm that this deplorable state of affairs can be remedied only by more preaching. Those who offer themselves for the Ministry must have two outstanding characteristics: an irreprehensible life and a measurable knowledge of Holy Scripture. The Ministry is not a dignity but a burdensome charge. He then examines, in detail, the twenty-two titles used in Holy Scripture to describe the ministers of God.

In the second part of the work Gérard devotes himself to the subject of preaching, "this holy vocation". It is, he claims, the most potent instruments for convincing the enemies of the Word of God. Its necessary pre-requisite is knowledge and aptitude to teach; "he that is ignorant ought not to be admitted", and he quotes Quintilian in support. "Unlearned men speak more high than those who have knowledge and wisdom, and they which know nothing make themselves ignorant of no kind of learning." His first academic requirements are Hebrew, Greek and Latin; all necessary for the adequate interpretation of Holy Scripture. But wealth of learning must not be exhibited, and the preacher should aim at simplicity. He then suggests six points for the would-be preacher:

1. Consider and meditate upon the text it is proposed to expound.

[1] Carter, E. H., *Norwich Subscription Books*, p. 46.

[2] Pryce, A. I., *The Diocese of Bangor during Three Centuries*, pp. 94 ff., i.e. from 1682 onwards. For improvement in Lincoln Diocese see *Lincoln Episcopal Registers*, 1571–84, pp. 454 ff. For the Diocese of Chester, 1686–7, see the *Diary of Thomas Cartwright*, Camden Society, 1843.

[3] It is the latter copy which has been consulted.

2. Draw out the opening of the sermon from the matter of the text itself.
3. Divide the sermon into various parts; two, three or four according to the matter to be handled.
4. Expound in order every doctrine that is to be found in the text which the preacher ought to enrich with diverse amplifications, neither too long nor too short, but as profitably and as fitly as he can with similitudes.
5. The preacher should use examples, sometimes more and sometimes less.
6. The conclusion should be "a short abridgement and summaries of that which he hath handled".

It is the fourth point which is most elaborated. A too succinct exposition, Gérard points out, fails to edify. It is vital to grasp the appropriate length to which any matter should be developed.

So far the preparation is academic and practical: the acquisition of learning and the study of preaching. But the Christian Ministry needs something more. Cranmer realized this in 1540 when he proposed that "in every Cathedral there should be provision made for readers of divinity, and of Greek and Hebrew; and a great number of students, to be exercised in the daily worship of God, and trained up in study and devotion.[1] This suggestion is now widely accepted in the Church with its many theological colleges in cathedral and university cities, where the daily worship of God is fundamental in the life of the ordinand, and where too he is assisted in his spiritual life. But this way of life was not quickly or easily achieved. Spiritual preparation began strangely and was accomplished slowly. In the reaction against Rome in the 16th century many religious customs were abandoned if they were not explicitly mentioned in the Bible. One such custom, which originated certainly not later than the 5th century, was this observance of the Ember Seasons. To Tyndale, the famous translator of the Bible, they were "open idolatry".[2] Nevertheless, in the canons of 1603 their observance is authorized.[3]

This is a notable regulation because it has no precedents in post-Reformation ecclesiastical legislation. The way in which the observance was resumed appears to have been as follows. In 1576 the Government was concerned about the fishing industry.[4] One way to support it was to encourage the eating of fish on fast days. This was done by Government decree, and among the fast days were specified the four Ember seasons. The bishops commended the observance to the clergy and the custom soon became widespread. Isaac Walton gives us a picture of Richard Hooker in his parish of Bishopsbourne in Kent during the years 1595 to 1600: Hooker, he writes, never

[1] G. Burnet, *The History of the Reformation*, ed. N. Pocock, Oxford, 1865, I, 477.
[2] Tyndale, W., *Exposition and Notes on Sundry Portions of the Holy Scriptures*, Parker Society, 1849, p. 98.
[3] Canon xxxi. The Solemn Times appointed to the making of ministers.
[4] Cardwell, E., *Documentary Annals*, I, 370. Commenting on this, Strype observes (*Remains of Edmund Grindal*, Parker Society, 1843, p. 336): "the thing being so advantageous for the breeding of seafaring men, so necessary in these times of danger." See also Wickham Legg, J., *English Church Life from the Restoration to the Tractarian Movement*, p. 213, n. 1, where even the cookery books of the following century refer to the dishes appropriate to Ember Days.

failed to give notice of the Ember Seasons to his parishioners, "persuading them both to fast and then to double their devotions for a learned and pious clergy; but especially the last, saying often, that the life of a pious clergyman was visible rhetoric".[1] This observance led to writing of the two Ember Prayers in the Prayer Book of 1662: the first by Bishop Cosin in 1627; the second by Archbishop Laud ten years later. The Church had come to realize that without the prayers of the Church as well as of the ordinand himself, preparation for the Ministry is imperfect.

But preaching and learning and prayer still did not go deep enough. How could a man tell that he should devote himself to Holy Orders. The learning of the universities equipped a man, partly at least, for one of several professions. And so men began to think of the nature of a special vocation in the Ministry and to discuss, after the manner of the moral theologian, problems where a man could not be quite sure about his true calling. The relevance of such consideration is underlined by the use of the word "vocation" to-day in many educational circles, where there is much attention given to vocational training and guidance but little attention to the nature of vocation itself. To the 16th-century thinker vocation comes from God. We are, in the words of the Catechism, to do our duty in that state of life unto which it shall please God to call us. Vocation is the work in life to which God calls us. To turn to Tyndale again—God calls men to be brewers and bakers, carpenters or Kings.[2] Amongst these vocations is the vocation to the Ministry. But it is more than just another vocation. It deserves more particular attention, because, as Sanderson wrote, it pertains to things more immediately belonging to God.[3] How, then, did God indicate this special calling? There was a time, says Becon, when God called men "immediately", as, for example, in the time of the prophets and the apostles. But this calling has now ceased. God now calls men "mediately", that is to say, God's call comes by means of men. Some stressed the more secular mediators of vocation; others the more ecclesiastical.[4] Becon said that magistrates and people could call men to the Ministry, but the more typical view was finally crystallized by Pearson—a man's calling, he wrote, is God's moving him from within and man conferring authority upon him from without.[5] Cases where a conflict might seem to arise were considered by Perkins in two courses of lectures delivered to the undergraduates at Cambridge early in the

[1] Walton I Lives (World's Classics), pp. 218 f.

[2] Tyndale, W., *Doctrinal Treatises* (1527), Parker Society, 1848, p. 102. Cf. Hutchinson, R., *Epistles to Cranmer*, 1550, Parker Society, 1852, p. 6.

[3] Sanderson, R., *Works*, Oxford, 1854, III, 91 ff. (A sermon in St Paul's Cathedral, 1621.)

[4] Becon, T., *Early Works*, Parker Society, 1943, III, 608 ff.

[5] Pearson, J., *The Minor Theological Works*, Oxford, 1844, I, 291. Necesse est ut duplex sit vocatio, a Deo interno movente, ab homine extrinsecus conferenti. Cf. Aquinas, where he distinguishes between the vocatio exterior prompted by the preacher, and the vocatio interior, which is the divinely planted impulse. (1 Q. 23, Art. 2.) Calvin uses almost identical terms, Inst., III, 24, 10.

17th century.[1] In 1602 he wrote "Two Treatises on the Calling of the Ministerie"—all men are called to be Christians first and foremost and to some other vocation secondarily. The secondary vocation to be a carpenter or physician must in no circumstances override the first, and when two secondary vocations are open to a man, say teaching or the Ministry, he should choose the more arduous of the two. The highest of all such vocations, said Perkins, is the Ministry of the Church.

So far we have considered regular and sustained prayer for the Ministry of the Church; we have attempted to understand more fully the significance of a vocation. Finally we have the testing of vocation. This was at first thought to be adequately undertaken at the universities. This is certainly true in the case of some exemplary students whose diaries or letters still remain. A typical case is that of John Wallis, who was a student of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, from 1632 to 1637.[2] He writes this account of his undergraduate days—"he went from logic to ethics, physicks and metaphysicks, consulting the Schoolmen on such points, according to the methods of philosophy then in fashion at that university. And I took it into the speculative part of physick and anatomy as parts of natural philosophy. And as Dr Glisson (then public professor in physick in the University) hath since told me, I was the first of his sons who, in a public disputation, maintained the circulation of the blood, which was then a new doctrine, though I had no design of practising physick. And I then imbibed the principle of what they now call the New Philosophy. For I made no scruple of diverting from the common road of studies then in fashion to any part of useful learning. . . . On the same account, I diverted also to astronomy and geography as parts of natural philosophy, and to other parts of mathematics; and though at that time they were scarce looked upon as academical studies then in fashion . . . I was early instructed in the principles of religion and catechetical divinity and the frequent reading of the scripture and other good books, and diligent attendance upon sermons. And whatever other studies I followed I was careful not to neglect this. And became timely acquainted with systematick and polemick theology and had the repute of a good proficient therein."

But such men were probably exceptional, and the more typical undergraduate probably merited the jibe that they were "often admitted to be teachers of the Church when they were fitted only to be catechumens".[3] Indeed, the conception of vocation began to be completely lost and men began rather to choose an eligible profession where a life of dignity and usefulness, befitting a gentleman, might be chosen.

The clerical profession, wrote Vicesimus Knox, himself a clergyman, is one in which (he is writing for prospective clergymen) a man "is at liberty to pursue one of the pleasantest and most tranquil paths

[1] Perkins, W., *Works*, 3 vols, Cambridge, 1608–9. See I, 727 ff. and III, 431 ff.
[2] Adamson, J. W. *A short History of Education*, Cambridge, 1919, pp. 186 f.
[3] The gibe is Humphrey Prideaux's (1648–1724).

of life".[1] This is the 18th-century view of the Ministry in its full decadence. But the work of Charles Simeon among the undergraduates at Cambridge and of the pioneers of the Oxford Movement won back a fuller understanding of vocation. It is significant that one of the earliest Tracts of the Times was published in 1834 and was concerned with the observance of Ember Days. The universities could in no sense be regarded as seminaries for clergymen, although they were still the preserves of the Church. Thirlwall indignantly rebutted the idea that the universities could even be thought of in this way.[2] They existed to provide a polite education. Such was sufficient, in the general view, for a clergyman. But Cranmer's ideal had not died. Burnet and Wilson, at the end of the 17th century, had given some specific training to their candidates for Holy Orders, but the opposition of the universities and other causes finally defeated their endeavour. However, the theological college was finally established, and the earliest surviving such institution was founded at Chichester in 1839. Here and in a number of similar colleges disciplined theological study and a regular life of devotion began to be practised. Such colleges were meant to be an addition to the university course. The first students were all graduates. Such training was never thought to be an alternative to a university training. This normative view was given expression by Bishop Westcott, and it is this view which most truly represents the Anglican conception.[3] That is not to say that it is unchallenged. Theological training as an alternative rather than an addition to university training has had a place in the thoughts of the Church ever since the days of John Wesley, and a considerable number of ordinands still test their vocation in this way. With characteristic compromise the Church maintains both systems.

F. Bussby.

Recent Anglican Revisions of the Eucharistic Prayer

In the April and May numbers of Theology in 1954 I gave some account of the revisions of the Eucharistic Liturgy which had been put out by four branches of the Anglican Communion—the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon, the Canadian Church, the Episcopal Church of U.S.A. and the Nippon Sei Ko Kwai (the Anglican Church in Japan). Two of these churches have revised their first proposals, and it may be of interest to readers to have some account of these further changes, partly as an indication of liturgical trends in the Anglican Communion and partly because they inevitably raise questions which must be of concern to us in the Church of England when we take up again the task of Prayer Book Revision.

I. We will consider first the present position in the Anglican

[1] Knox, V., *Essays, London*, 1827, p. 92.
[2] Thirlwall, C., *Letters*, London, 1881, I, 114 (Letter of 1834).
[3] Westcott propounded his views in two papers delivered to the Church Congress at Nottingham on 12th October 1871 and to the Ely Diocesan Conference, 24th October 1871.

Church of Canada. It will be recalled that the Order described in the first of my two articles was put out solely for study purposes. At the 1955 General Synod held at Edmonton, Alberta, however, a complete revision of the Prayer Book was authorized for experimental use until the next General Synod in 1958. This "Draft Prayer Book" contains a form of Eucharistic Liturgy different from that in the "Study Rite".

In the Ante-Communion the changes from the Study Rite are not great, while in the Prayer for the Church the only difference of importance is the strengthening of the language concerned with the commemoration of the departed. The Canon, however, has been radically revised. Whereas the Study Rite was content to provide a Eucharistic beginning to the Consecration Prayer and an anamnesis of the barest proportions, leaving the Prayer of Oblation in the 1662 position, the Draft Prayer Book has not only the Eucharistic opening, but a much fuller and more explicit anamnesis, incorporating with it most of the Prayer of Oblation. The clause concerning the self-oblation of the communicants is retained, however, in the 1662 post-Communion position by the neat device of incorporating it into the middle of the Prayer of Thanksgiving.

It may help to put the two forms in parallel columns:

Study Rite.	*Draft Prayer Book.*
The Pax.	
Sursum Corda and Sanctus.	
	Benedictus may be used.
Blessing and glory and thanksgiving be unto thee Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to take our nature upon him and to suffer death upon the Cross . . . as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.	
Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, in union with all thy holy Church, we do this in remembrance of him who died, and rose again, and ever liveth to make intercession for us, presenting unto thy divine Majesty this our thankoffering and service, through the merits and mediation of thy beloved Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, by whom, etc.	Wherefore, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, in union with all thy holy Church, we thy humble servants remember before thee the precious death, the mighty resurrection, and the glorious ascension of thy beloved Son; And looking for his coming again in glory, we present unto thy divine Majesty this holy Bread of eternal life and this Cup of everlasting salvation; And we entirely desire thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving . . . benefits of his passion; And we pray that by the power of thy Holy Spirit, all we who are partakers of this holy Com-

munion may be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction; through Jesus Christ our Lord, by whom, etc.

The Pax.

The Prayer of Humble Access.

In an article published in the *Canadian Churchman* of 3rd and 17th November 1955, Father R. F. Palmer, a member of the Canadian Congregation of S.S.J.E. and one of the architects of the new Canadian Draft Prayer Book, has given a defence of the new Canon. By adopting an order and form of words that sets Consecration in a context of Thanksgiving, by holding fast the reference to "the full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction" and by using the phrase "this holy Bread of eternal life and this Cup of everlasting salvation" (a phrase which admittedly comes in the Roman Canon, but which has Anglican precedent in South Africa and which, as the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in their reply to Pope Leo XIII showed, expresses a primitive doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice held by Anglicans, but not by later Roman teaching), the Canadian revisers have sought to bring "the Great Prayer in the revised Book . . . more obviously into line with the primitive form". Fr Palmer is at pains to show that there is no room in this Prayer for any idea of a fresh immolation of Christ or for the reintroduction of the medieval errors and abuses condemned in Article 31.

Evangelicals, on the other hand, are not so sure. Can one turn the clock back, they ask, quite so easily as this? For fifteen hundred years at least the Words of Institution have been regarded in the West as the formula of consecration. Whatever the original significance of the references to the Bread of eternal life and the Cup of everlasting salvation, therefore, for many centuries they have expressed the idea of the offering of the Body and Blood of Christ. Must they not in practice continue to express this doctrine, particularly in view of the fact that the order for a second consecration still requires only the bare recital of the Words of Institution?

It is clear that there will be much discussion and heart-searching over these words in the next two years in Canada, and appeals for help and advice are already being received on this side of the Atlantic.

II. How have things been faring meanwhile in the other Church which has made a considerable revision of its first proposals—the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon?

The title "The Holy Eucharist" has been dropped, which is a pity, for it has greater claims to being primitive than "the Lord's Supper", which, as used by St Paul, is probably not a title at all[1] and in any case refers to the combined Agape-cum-Eucharist. The problem of the Prayer for the Church and intercession for non-Christian rulers is met by making the Prayer a General Intercession, though leaving it in its 1662 post-Offertory position. Otherwise, as in Canada, the

[1] Cf. W. K. Lowther Clarke, *Concise Bible Commentary*, p. 244.

changes that are of greatest significance come in the Canon. Once again we will place the two forms side by side:

Indian 1951.	*Indian* 1954.
Sursum Corda and Sanctus.	
Holy in truth art thou, and blessed in truth, O Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for that thou of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to take our nature upon him and renew thine image within us, and to suffer death . . . coming again;	The same, omitting the clause "and renew thine image within us".
Hear us, O merciful Father . . . his most blessed Body and Blood;	Omitted.
Who in the same night . . . thanks to thee, his God and Father, he brake . . . in remembrance of me.	Who in the same night . . . thanks to thee, he brake . . . in remembrance of me. *People.* Amen.
Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before thy Divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, which we here offer unto thee, the memorial thy Son hath commanded us to make; having in remembrance his blessed passion, and precious death, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension; rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same, and looking for his coming again with power and great glory.	Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants, having in remembrance the blessed passion and precious death of thy dear Son, his mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension, do render unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same; offering unto thy Divine Majesty these thy holy gifts as the memorial which he hath commanded us to make, and looking for his coming again with power and great glory.
And we humbly beseech thee, most merciful Father, to send down thy holy and life-giving Spirit upon us and these thy gifts, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy most dearly beloved Son; entirely desiring thy fatherly goodness to accept upon thy heavenly altar this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, that by the merits and death of the same thy son	And we entirely desire thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept on high this our sacrifice of praise . . . benefits of his passion. And we humbly beseech thee, most merciful Father, to send down thy holy and life-giving Spirit upon us and upon these thy gifts, that the bread which we brake may be the communion

. . . etc. (to the end of the Prayer of Oblation).	of the Body of Christ and the cup which we bless may be the communion of his Blood; and grant that all we who are partakers of this Holy Communion may be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body in thy Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ. *People.* Amen. And here we offer . . . living sacrifice unto thee. And although we be unworthy . . . etc. (to the end of the Prayer of Oblation).

The Lord's Prayer.
The Pax may be said.

The Benedictus may be said.	
Agnus Dei may be said or sung.	Prayer of Humble Access.
Prayer of Humble Access.	Agnus Dei may be said or sung.

This 1954 Indian Rite rightly omits the clause "Hear us, O merciful Father . . ." which is unnecessary when the Canon includes at a later point a petition for right communion. It makes the main clause of the anamnesis paragraph an offering of thanks for the benefits that flow from Christ's redemptive work, adding to this giving of thanks an offering of the Eucharistic gifts in terms that recall Justin Martyr (cf. Dial. 41, "The Bread of the Eucharist is offered as a memorial of the passion"). Thus the significance of the offering of the gifts is expressed in a way that goes back behind later theological developments. Further, the 1954 Rite rightly asks for the acceptance on high of the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving before asking for the sending down of the Holy Spirit. The actual words of the Epiclesis are changed to the form in the C.S.I. Liturgy based on 1 Cor. 10. 16; the Epiclesis is thus clearly a petition for the fruits of a right communion and not a form of consecration. On the other hand, the 1954 Indian Rite, like the Canadian Draft Prayer Book, retains the Fraction, as well as the other manual acts, in the 1662 position and also orders the repetition of the Words of Institution alone at a second consecration.

III. The Canadian and Indian revisions are both attempts to express more adequately the theological outlook and the liturgical pattern of the early centuries, as indeed all the proposals recently put out in the Anglican Communion have sought to do. Neither perhaps has yet reached definitive form. It is unlikely that the Canadian anamnesis will survive the next General Synod unscathed and the Indian Episcopal Synod meeting in January 1956 has reverted to

the 1951 anamnesis for the next experimental period. In the process of revision, however, various problems are raised, of which reference may here be made to three.

The first problem is—Should we attempt to revise the Consecration Prayer at all? The Rev. David Paton has replied (THEOLOGY, April 1956) to the Rev. Adrian Carey's plea for the 1662 Prayer alone (February 1956), and only a few points need be added. (1) It is historically incorrect to talk as though all Anglicans had used the 1552-type Prayer happily for 300 years. Dr Srawley tells us that "a certain degree of dissatisfaction with the Consecration Prayer of 1552, and a preference for the form of 1549, find expression in a series of Anglican divines during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries".[1] The Non-Jurors broke with 1662, it has not been the sole rite in Scotland since the early 18th century, and has been unknown in the American Church since 1789. To-day, as Mr Paton shows, the tide is flowing against it in many parts of the Anglican Communion and the strength of that tide is likely to increase. (2) Perhaps 1662 should remain as one Consecration Prayer in any future English revision, but to refuse any other Consecration Prayer is to be unrealistic. Official action culminating in the 1927–8 Canon, as well as the unofficial use of the Interim Rite, interpolations from the Roman Mass, etc., show that it is supremely at this point that "the law of public worship in the Church of England is too narrow" for our needs. A negative policy would certainly lead to an Anglo-Catholic revolt; it might make others think of establishing a branch of C.S.I. with its excellent Liturgy in England! (3) Anglican loyalty does not consist in dogged adherence to everything our Reformers believed or ordered, but in making the same appeal as they did to the Scriptures and to "what the Catholic fathers and ancient bishops have collected out of the same". The Church of England cannot, I believe, turn its back on all the new knowledge and insights concerning Eucharistic origins without being false to its own character. Its task must be precisely that of finding, not acrimoniously, but eirenically, a "common mind in a changed order of service".

Granted the need for revision, the second problem is—How far back should we go in our endeavour to recover a pattern of Consecration Prayer at once primitive and in accord with Scriptural teaching?The Principal of St Stephen's House, Oxford, expresses the conclusion of modern liturgical study when he describes the purpose of the Eucharistic Prayer as "to unite the Holy People of God in giving thanks to God the Father, as the Lord himself gave thanks the night before he suffered" (THEOLOGY, August 1955; cf. Dix, *Shape of the Liturgy*, pp. 214 ff.). Earlier than either the Western or Eastern theories of consecration is the practice which the Christian Church, following our Lord's example, took over from Judaism of consecration by thanksgiving. (Failure to recognize this fact was the great error of the 1928 revisers.)

The Rev. Bernard J. Wigan would accordingly have us revise our

[1] *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 344.

Consecration Prayer, so that it gave expression to this note of thanksgiving alone. Criticizing the recent suggested revision of the American Liturgy, he has written, "Among the many notions concerning the origin of the Eucharist which have been brought forward, it may surely be claimed that two at least have proved themselves and must be the basis of any revision of the liturgy which is to measure up to its evangelical purpose; that our Lord's Prayer at the Last Supper was a Jewish thanksgiving-blessing, and that the essential structure of the rite consisted of taking, blessing, breaking, giving—in that order. . . . The 'thanksgiving-blessing' of the Last Supper and the early liturgies had given way long before (Cranmer's) time to a form of Eucharistic Prayer which was, however disguised, no longer a thanksgiving but a petition. This is true of the East as well as of the West. . . . Our Lord 'gave thanks' and said 'do this'. If we can bring ourselves to obey his command without equivocation, many of the argumentations of liturgiologists and some of the problems of eucharistic theology will cease to exist." (*Episcopal Churchnews*, 6th March 1955.)

Dr Massey H. Shepherd, Jr, a member of the Standing Liturgical Commission and a leading liturgical scholar of the American Church, while agreeing with Mr Wigan's plea for the recovery of the "Four Action" Shape, strongly contested his argument about the content of the Consecration Prayer in the next number of *Episcopal Churchnews* (20th March 1955). "Our Anglican tradition is not that of the Puritans. While we appeal to Scripture as the basis of the doctrine of our liturgy, we have never sought to recreate a New Testament rite. . . . In the passage of the Gospel from a Jewish to a Gentile environment, there was development in its liturgical forms and expressions no less than in its creedal statements and organizational structure." Dr Shepherd points out that even the Jewish thanksgiving over the cup of Blessing, said by our Lord, had a petition—for the coming of the Kingdom. The classical pattern of the Eucharistic Prayer in the branches of the Anglican Communion that have abandoned or never had the 1662 form, represents "the acceptance of that fullness of tradition that comes to us from the undivided Church. Our Prayer of Consecration is still a form of thanksgiving. It begins with praise and ends in a doxology, and its recital of the saving events is offered as a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving."

There is an issue here which needs further discussion. Perhaps Mr Couratin helps us best by showing how the thanksgiving-blessing of the Upper Room worked itself out in the pattern of the Eucharistic prayer in the early liturgical tradition (THEOLOGY, February 1956). Can we not think in terms of reproducing that pattern in our own liturgy by the provision of a revised Consecration Prayer along the general lines proposed in Canada and India, whatever reservations we may have about their particular wording? Both make the whole Prayer an act of Thanksgiving, both so word the Epiclesis that it is a prayer for right communion, not a prayer of consecration.

The third problem concerns the rhythm of the Prayer. In a letter in THEOLOGY (October 1955) Professor R. H. Fuller rightly spoke of the movement of the Eucharist as oblation-consecration. The Euchar-

istic Worship of the People of God, of those who are already members of Christ's body, consists of the lifting up to the Father of praise and thanksgiving for all he has given in Creation and Redemption, of the making remembrance of the saving events and of the offering to him of the bread and wine now brought into association with this memorial act.[1] This is the 'upward' movement. In response there is the 'downward' movement of God in consecration and in the gift of all the benefits of Christ's Passion and Resurrection in communion, wherein the Church completes her act of worship. In a liturgical rite so patterned there is no clearly marked 'moment of consecration' and the oblation is eucharistic and commemorative.

Certainly Evangelicals can approve of rites like those of Canada and India only if such a rhythm is clearly discernible in them. If, however, features such as the ordering of the recital of the Words of Institution only for a second consecration remain, then a different rhythm will be evident. The rite will naturally be interpreted in terms of the Western theory of consecration, the offering of the Bread and the Wine will be understood as the offering of Christ's Body and Blood, and hesitations will be felt on the score of Article 31. Not a few churchmen, in that event, would point to such a statement as that of the Doctrinal Commission, "if the Eucharist is . . . spoken of as a sacrifice, it must be understood as a sacrifice in which (to speak as exactly as the subject allows) we do not offer Christ but where Christ unites us with himself in the self-offering of the life that was 'obedient unto death, yea the death of the Cross' " (*Doctrine in the C. of E.*, p. 162). If we in England are to have a Consecration Prayer nearer to the primitive pattern than that of 1662, we must take care to see that our revised liturgy is still patient of the variety of interpretations which have historically been recognized as having a rightful place in the Anglican tradition.

C. Kenneth Sansbury.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. Frank Bennett is Vicar of Maidstone and an Hon. Canon of Canterbury Cathedral.

Dr Moorman is Principal of Chichester Theological College and Chancellor of Chichester Cathedral.

The Rev. F. Bussby is Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bournemouth.

Dr Sansbury is Warden of St Augustine's College, Canterbury, and an Hon. Canon of Canterbury Cathedral.

---

[1] Cf. J. H. Srawley, *The Early History of the Liturgy*, p. 223. "The act of offering is regarded as recalling in type and symbol the sacrifice of Christ and representing it by way of commemoration."

CORRESPONDENCE

AUTHORIZED VERSIONS?

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I am somewhat puzzled by the statement in both the April and May issues that it is not permissible to read in churches any alternative to the A.V. except the R.V. As far as I can see, there is just nothing in the Rubrics or the Canons—which were anterior of course to the A.V.—to prevent us from reading Phillips or Rieu or any other translation, and I regularly use both Rieu and Phillips. So long as we use the appointed passages, how can the reading of them in modern English be "illegal"? Surely to goodness, in this day, we clergy should use our common sense and not be hide-bound by the rigidity of a bygone age?

When I asked my bishop about the use of modern translations, his sensible comment was: "Why not?"

Yours faithfully,
R. G. F. WADDINGTON.

THE VICARAGE,
EMBSAY,
SKIPTON.

[We are very grateful for this letter. We confess that we wrote "without the book". We had supposed—and it seems to be a common impression—that the words "appointed to be read in churches" on the title-page of the A.V. implied that it was officially and exclusively authorized for public reading in church, until the authorization was extended to the R.V. in the last century. Both these suppositions appear to be unwarranted. There is no record of any decree ordaining the use of the A.V., by King or Parliament or Convocation (see Sir Frederick Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*, 1939, p. 232). Although the R.V. was presented to Convocation on 30th April 1885 and Queen Victoria accepted a copy (see A. C. Benson, *The Life of Edward White Benson*, ii, 56), it was left to make its way as the A.V. had been. In *Liturgy and Worship*, 1932, p. 301, Dr Lowther Clarke wrote: "It may be asked what version of the Bible may be used (sc. in church). Until recently no one thought of any other than the Authorized Version. Nowadays, with the passing of the desire for uniformity, no objection is likely to be raised to the Revised. . . . The matter is left open by the recent revisions (of the B.C.P.)." We conclude, therefore, that no permission is needed for the use of the R.S.V. or of modern translations. We shall have more to say on this subject next month.—Ed. THEOLOGY.]

PSALTER REVISION

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

May I be allowed to make a few corrections in Mr Taylor's article on Psalter Revision, published in the June number? I am probably the only person left who had anything to do with the 1916 Revision. The Archbishop's Committee was appointed in 1913, not

1916, the year in which the Report was published. The new text was revised by two bishops and adopted as an instalment of Prayer Book revision. The intention was to authorize its use in the same way as the 1922 *Lectionary*, in advance of the Prayer Book as whole. But the measure to this effect, introduced by the House of Bishops into the Church Assembly in 1923, was dropped. When the "Deposited Book" was published in 1927, the suggestions for making the use of certain verses optional were adopted, but the text of the Psalter remained unchanged. So it cannot be said that "the House of Laity rejected this moderately revised Psalter of 1916 as part of the Revised Prayer Book of 1928". At the time it was understood that Archbishop Davidson's pledge to the House of Laity that the 1662 Book would be printed intact would have necessitated the printing of two complete versions of the Psalter, which was clearly impracticable.

I take the opportunity of adding some notes on speech-rhythm psalters based on an inquiry prompted by another purpose.

The actual origin of the innovation seems to have been at Wells Cathedral, where until 1935 the choir used to sing the Psalms in speech-rhythm style from ordinary Prayer Books in which bars had been inserted by hand. Dr Robert Bridges used to pay frequent visits to Wells, during which he discussed the principles of chanting with Dr Davies (Organist 1899–1933, Canon and Precentor 1920–47). Dr Davies introduced the method in 1907; whether or not it was based on an earlier one does not seem to be known. Dr Bridges, by the way, used to maintain the superiority of Anglican chants for the Psalms in English, plainsong being designed for Latin. Obviously, the Wells method was possible only in churches where the boys practised daily.

A pioneer book on the new method was *The Barless Psalter*, by the Rev. Walter Marshall, published in 1913. It had little success, and the work had to be done again with more thoroughness. Sir Sydney Nicholson wrote: "The idea of speech-rhythm chanting originated (at least in its modern form) with Dr Robert Bridges: at all events it was he who formulated the main principles on which so many others have built. Combining in himself the qualities of a most eminent man of letters with those of a keen musician, he was exceptionally well equipped to deal with the problem: and he laid it down as a principle that, whatever kind of musical setting was employed for the Psalter, it must be so elastic as not to obscure the natural rhythm or emphasis of its matchless language. The music, in short, must be adapted to fit the words and the words not distorted to fit the music."

A large committee formed to produce a Psalter on these lines was unable to make progress and was dissolved, the task being taken up by a few of the members, including Nicholson. Publication was so long delayed that in the end the work fell to Sir Walford Davies and the Rev. A. Ramsbotham. *The Psalter Newly Pointed*, as it was entitled, had been actually forestalled by rival books on similar lines. When it appeared, in 1925, it was generally recognized as in a sense the best but defeating its object by over-elaboration of signs. Nichol-

son therefore decided to produce his own book, called *The Parish Psalter* (1928), with the help of the Westminster Abbey choir. "We realized that there is in many cases no 'best pointing' for a particular verse, so much depending on the particular chant to which it is sung; and we did not want to make big changes in our Abbey chants. So we hit on the expedient of enlisting the interest and help of the choir and, through the generosity of the Lay Vicars in attending a short practice before service each day for a month, armed with pencils with which to make alterations in the existing books, we gradually made our own new pointing by modifying the old, naturally only introducing changes when we felt that they were a real improvement." *The Parish Psalter* became widely known through the Royal School of Church Music, which used it for choir festivals. If it has distanced its competitors, the probable reason is the practical mind of the editor, who did without a committee and avoided too drastic changes.

Yours, etc.,
W. K. Lowther Clarke.

Q

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

In connexion with the above may I draw attention to an article of mine in *The Expositor* of October 1923 (pp. 284–97) in which I suggested the possibility that the one mutilated copy of Mark (Streeter's μ) had not only lost its last page but also 18 pages at the end of chapter ix. This theory has never been refuted, the only two objections raised against it being (1) that some of my calculations were inexact, (2) that no codex of such format could have existed at the date I suggested.

Both these criticisms were dramatically refuted by the later discovery of a codex fragment among the Chester Beatty papyri which showed (1) that my calculations contained an error of only 0·5 per cent., (2) that a codex of the exact form suggested was actually in existence even before the date given.

If there is anything in this theory it would give Q its death blow.

Yours sincerely,
B. P. W. Stather Hunt.

145 Earlham Road,
Norwich.

A NON-PROFESSIONAL MINISTRY

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

It would be very difficult to draw a sharp line between legitimate and illegitimate occupations in which "part-time priests" may or may not occupy themselves, for vocation enters into the problem,

and what may be right and legitimate for one may be a temptation to another. Whatever may be the relevance of Mr Jones' contention in your May number, that the Church must distinguish between work worth doing and that which is a waste of time, I believe his ideas to be diametrically opposed to the vocation of worker-priest, for this is a missionary vocation. A "part-time priest" may fill his spare time with "legitimate" occupations, or may maintain himself with "legitimate" work so that he can give his spare time to the work for which he was ordained. On the other hand the worker-priest throws himself amongst those in need of redemption wherever they are, that by working side by side with them he may approach men who otherwise would avoid the impact of the Gospel. To fulfil this vocation he must be prepared to go anywhere where there is a "notable lack of christianity", whether it is amongst the scientists at an atomic plant or amongst the unskilled workers at the docks. He must certainly not avoid those who by economic necessity are forced to earn their living in what they know to be "illegitimate" work, nor those who have drifted into dead-end occupations through lethargy or lack of intelligence. The worker-priest will accept "illegitimate" or futile work in the prayer that he may not only convert individuals from such circles, but that he and the "Church" he creates round him may also "christianize the milieu", even if such christianization may mean the ultimate death of some "illegitimate" spheres of work.

Yours sincerely,
BASIL MINCHIN.

BEDMINSTER VICARAGE,
BRISTOL, 3.
10*th May* 1956.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE INTERPRETER'S BIBLE. Vol. 5. Nelson. 67s. 6d.

The fifth volume of the *Interpreter's Bible* is concerned with Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Isaiah and Jeremiah. The introductory article on Ecclesiastes, as well as its exegesis, was written by the late Professor Rankin. He regards the term Koheleth as signifying "the office of speaker in an assembly" (p. 3), and the book is therefore to be thought of as an address, discourse or lecture. It largely represents the work which originally left the hands of its author, although of course it contains many later additions designed to bring it more into conformity with Judaic thought. He rejects the view that Koheleth is a Hebrew translation of an Aramaic original and explains the Aramaisms as being due to the fact that Aramaic was the common speech of the day. Professor Rankin favours a Palestinian setting for the work and agrees with most scholars in placing its composition between 250–200 B.C. The affinity of thought with Greek philosophy is again to be explained by the consideration that Hellenism was part of the culture of the day rather than by the theory of direct dependence on Greek writers.

In his introduction to the Song of Songs, Professor T. J. Meek rejects, among others, the Allegorical and Secular Love Song interpretations in favour of a Liturgical one. "The Song of Songs is the survival . . . of ancient Hebrew New Year liturgies that celebrated the reunion and marriage of the sun god with the mother goddess" (p. 94). In the course of time other folk liturgies were added, and thus it is that the work is not by one hand but consists of a "group of poems on a common theme that grew up with the people over the centuries" (p. 97). The commonly accepted date of the book places it in about the 3rd century B.C., but Dr Meek argues that some at least of the work goes back to the 9th century, although he admits that the present form of the text may derive from the 3rd century.

Professor R. B. Y. Scott analyses the contents of Isaiah 1–39 into (*a*) oracles uttered by the prophet, (*b*) memoirs of the prophet, (*c*) prophetic biography concerning the prophet, and (*d*) miscellaneous material including a considerable number of anonymous oracles which cannot be attributed to Isaiah. As to the composition of these chapters, he says they "contain material from Isaiah himself written in the eighth century, no less certainly material from the period of the Exile, and very probably material from three or even four centuries later still" (p. 152). He concludes his introduction with a discussion of the theology of the prophet and in his exegesis he takes into account the text of the Dead Sea Scroll of Isaiah.

Dealing with Isaiah chs. 40–66, Professor J. Muilenburg holds the generally accepted view that chs. 40–55 are to be distinguished from chs. 56–66 and form a unity in themselves. They were composed in Babylon by the Second Isaiah, while it is likely that chs. 56–66 "are the work of the followers of the prophet" (p. 384). Unlike some modern writers (e.g. Pfeiffer), he has a high opinion of both the language and reasoning of the work of the Second Isaiah. He thinks that the poems were written rather than spoken and suggests that as well as having delivered them himself the prophet may have sent them to various groups of exiles. In discussing the background of the prophecies Dr Muilenburg gives a very admirable sketch of the historical situation, while his treatment of the theology of the prophet is equally stimulating. He expresses the view that the Servant refers to Israel: "Israel, and Israel alone, is able to bear all that is said about the servant of the Lord" (p. 411). The Servant is, however, "a figure of the coming age" (p. 413), and a reference to him is to be discerned in the words of Jesus. Professor Muilenburg follows this introduction with an enlightening exegesis.

Professor H. P. Hyatt is eminently qualified to write on the book of Jeremiah. He has long been occupied with the study of the book and has hitherto advocated views which differ from those of the traditional position. It is therefore no surprise to find that the opinions he presents here follow the pattern of his previous studies on the date and ministry of the prophet. He makes the interesting suggestion that 626 B.C. is to be regarded as the year of Jeremiah's birth rather than of his call. The foe from the north, usually interpreted as the Scythians, is identified with the Babylonians. Accord-

ingly, "the earliest messages of Jeremiah were delivered in the reign of Jehoiakim (609–598)" (p. 780). Far from ever approving of Deuteronomy, Jeremiah opposed some of its basic tenets. But few British scholars would accept this view of the prophet; yet historical considerations and the literary analysis of the book combine to support Hyatt's contentions. Acceptance of 626 as the date of the prophet's call involves two inherent difficulties. One is the difficulty experienced in attempting to identify the foe from the north with an historical enemy which according to the prophet would appear shortly after his call; the other that of determining Jeremiah's relationship with Deuteronomy. The Scythians are thought to have invaded Palestine round 626, but there is no definite evidence to support this supposition. The genuine text of Jeremiah suggests that the prophet made little if any reference to Deuteronomy. It would be hard to explain this if he began his ministry five years before the publication of the code, while on the other hand we could understand his silence regarding it if he assumed his office in 608, some twelve years after its publication. Moreover, the theological implicates of the prophet's teaching are the better understood in the light of this transitional age. Hyatt believes that the New Covenant contains the teaching but not the words of Jeremiah.

Altogether this is an admirable volume on the Old Testament. Reliable scholarship is combined with a suggestive exegesis and a useful exposition. It should therefore prove very valuable to those who require a trustworthy and fruitful interpretation of the books concerned.

C. F. Whitley.

University College of North Wales.

Surprised by Joy: The Shape of My Early Life. By C. S. Lewis. Geoffrey Bles. 15s.

Professor Lewis has distinguished himself in many genres—moral theology, literary criticism, education, space fiction, as well as children's books and a little verse. In this book all these, except the last, are blended into a rather powerful cocktail. Maybe I was rather stupid or dull the first time I read it, and that was why I found it harder than his other books to take in. Maybe he did not rewrite and correct as much as he does in his other writing. So I have read it three times, and have found it each time more illuminating and interesting than the last. Like St Augustine's Confessions, it contains the history of the author's conversion and tells us the best and the worst about him. And I do not think I am exaggerating if I say it stands comparison with that spiritual classic and literary masterpiece and that, like it, it will be more read than its author's other works, good as they are.

Books like *Robert Elsmere*, or *Father and Son*, or *The Fifth Army Fell Back* are depressing accounts of a loss of faith. Here we have an account, at once warning and encouraging, of another's fall into un-

belief and rising again to faith and grace. Dr Lewis is frank and outspoken—especially in his rather appalling account of "Wyvern", a great English public school. But he so avoids both false humility and false pride, and preserves courtesy and good taste, that the reader never feels either that he has intruded, nor yet that he has been intruded upon. Dr Lewis says his hands are incapable of wielding tool, bat, or racquet, and so there was nothing he could do but write! He is so scrupulous in acknowledging his debts to teachers and friends that he seems to suggest that he is a mere spermologos without an original idea in his head. Yet we know that, wherever he got the raw jewels from, he has at the very least done the cutting and setting of them, and in this shown himself to be a great artist in words, who can make old truths that we had thought dead and stale come alive again, thanks to his power of exposition and illustration. In this at least he is notably original, because he is capable of being and can afford to be himself. And in any case we remember that Shakespeare has only one original plot!

Why is he so well able to deal with modern doubts and difficulties, and to tell us whether they come from the intellect or the imagination or just from our environment? Because he is an adult convert, who has gone through it all himself and knows the antidotes. Where did he get that sharply observant and critical eye, which takes no statement for granted, but insists on seeing its credentials? Perhaps because he is an Irishman, born and brought up in Belfast, who disliked England at first sight (the flat landscape seemed "like the banks of the Styx", and "the strange English voices like the voices of demons"), but, as he says, he has since long made up the quarrel and come to know and love English people and landscapes. If Chesterton rediscovered Brighton pier, and therefore wrote with such freshness and gusto, Dr Lewis did not need to be so reborn imaginatively, since he is already an explorer from another land, like (and yet so unlike) Bernard Shaw. (For one thing, he was never a puritan and never had any inhibitions until he became a Christian.)

English readers will be pleased to recognize persons and places they know. I too may be allowed to boast—I know that (Presbyterian) church with the queer-shaped tower and the Greek inscription (*Achris hou an elthe*)—that "excellent form master called Octy", who introduced him to Arnold's "Sohrab and Rustum" in his term at Campbell College with its red brick towers, introduced me to *Paradise Lost*—I knew the very delightful lady he calls "the Valkyrie", and have met the painter friend Arthur.

"Et in Arcadia ego", and to employ Virgil's words:

> "nec sum animi dubius, verbis ea vincere magnum
> quam sit, et angustis hunc addere rebus honorem."

But I will atone for thus straying by plunging right into the middle of the current. This, or the *leit-motif* of the book, is the quest for "Joy". "Joy" is defined as "*An unsatisfied desire which is itself more desirable than any other satisfaction*". (William Morris, a

favourite poet, suggests it too in "When very longing was but happiness".) This "Joy" is a gap, a sensitivity, a need, and negative rather than positive. Like the Eros Diotima described to Socrates, it is the son of poverty—but Dr Lewis denies that it is always attending on Aphrodite or has anything to do with sex. He also denies that joy is continuous with grace and revelation, or even prepares for them—but it does point towards them, indicate a need they can fulfil. Yet, as he tells us, this "Joy" has ceased to have much interest for him since he became a Christian.

He had taken the Faith for granted as a child. As a boy it was first softened by "higher thought", and then destroyed. Over-conscientiousness about the sincerity of his prayers had made them a burden of which he was glad to be relieved. After this his intellect is atheistic, and all the things in which he believes are grim and meaningless. But he does not starve his imagination as Darwin confesses he did. The things he loves are all imaginary. Mythology, Norse Greek and a little Celtic, Morris, Wagner, Yeats, Spenser feed his imagination. Then he discovers George MacDonald and Chesterton, who serve to Christianize his taste and imagination. In spite of a Confirmation and first Communion in unbelief (which he calls "the worst action of his life") during his boyhood, he is first stirred by a fellow-officer in France who has a conscience. Then, at Oxford, he meets and makes friends with intelligent Christians, and moves intellectually to Idealism. But the Absolute, that unmoved Mover, does not satisfy him. He moves to Theism. Then one day he goes to Whipsnade without a belief in the Incarnation, and comes back believing that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. He has moved, or been moved, from the one to the other without excitement or emotion, but at a definite place and time, and moved decisively and once for all. He is free, free even from "Joy", no longer dominated by it, though surely not without it.

This is not a book to borrow from a friend or a library. It is a book to possess, a book to give or receive as a present, a book that deserves to be read and re-read by Christian and non-Christian alike.

C. W. Quin.

St John's, Cork.

Ordination to the Priesthood. By John Bligh, S.J. Sheed and Ward. 16s.

This is an historical and theological commentary on the rite of ordination to the priesthood in the modern Roman Pontifical, and it has been written for the express purpose of helping candidates for the priesthood in the Latin section of the Roman Catholic Church to approach the sacrament of Holy Orders more intelligently and devoutly. Fr Bligh's book will, however, be of use to a much wider public than this, for there is little available in English on the subject of ordination rites, and the subject is one of great importance in view of current reunion schemes and projects for liturgical revision. Both of these are often approached from a background of theological and

historical ignorance which such a book as this can do much to enlighten.

The book begins with a statement of the theology of priesthood and passes on to a brief account of the development of the present Roman rite. This is followed by a discussion of the various views that have been held as to the essentials and non-essentials of the rite and of the relation of ordination to the Ember seasons. These conclude the first and shorter section of the work.

The second and very much longer section consists of a commentary on the various sections of the rite. This is carried out with admirable clarity; each prayer of the rite is reproduced in Latin with an English translation, the ceremonial directions are detailed, the symbolical significance is explained and any theological problems are discussed at length. In consequence the book is not only interesting to read but it is also extremely easy to refer to—and this is more than can be said about all books on liturgical matters. The Anglican reader will be startled by the extent to which, in his determination to acquit the Roman pontiffs of error, Fr Bligh upholds the right and power of the Pope to lay down and to alter the essentials of valid ordination. Thus the fact that two bulls of Boniface IX give a priest power to ordain to the priesthood shows that the Pope can change the minister of the sacrament; the fact that Eugenius IV informed the Armenians that the form and matter of ordination consisted of a ceremony which, though he did not know this, was unknown before the 10th century shows that the Pope can institute a new form and matter; while the fact that Pius XII in the Constitution *Sacramentum Ordinis* explicitly limited the scope of his decree to the period from 30th November 1947 onwards shows that the form and matter which the Pope makes necessary at one time may not be necessary at a different date. A simple explanation might be that popes are sometimes not only ignorant but even also mistaken about certain matters, and that the present Roman Pontiff, in his laudable determination to reduce confusion to order, was anxious so far as possible to save the faces of his predecessors.

This is, however, a small point, and it does not affect the fact that Fr Bligh has provided us with what deserves to become a standard work of reference on the subject with which it deals. There are seven delightful plates from early written and printed pontificals.

E. L. Mascall, O.G.S.

Christ Church,
Oxford.

SHORTER NOTICES

And After This. By H. N. Hancock. Longmans. 8s. 6d.

Psychical Research. By R. C. Johnson. English Universities Press. 6s.

The Fate of the Soul: an interpretation of some primitive concepts. By R. Firth. Frazer Lecture for 1955. Cambridge University Press. 2s. 6d.

These three books all deal with the problem of individual survival after death. They do so from very different standpoints, and if none is entirely satisfactory this, at least in part, reflects the present state of thought in general rather than the shortcomings of the particular authors.

Of the three, Mr Hancock has undoubtedly set himself the most difficult task "to interpret to the ordinary man the Christian belief in eternal life". The chapters read as if they were originally a series of popular addresses or lectures, and as such they would surely have had a powerful impact. Mr Hancock has tried to consider what *facts* we have at our disposal on which to base a reasoned belief in life after death. It is regrettable that the treatment is often superficial and that fact, faith and hope are not always clearly distinguished. The author modestly states that the book makes "no claim to profound scholarship or originality of thought", but it contains some stimulating ideas which it would seem very worth while to work over carefully and with due consideration of possible alternative theories which might be put forward to cover the same facts.

Dr Johnson in his book is not primarily interested in the problem of survival but in surveying the field of study covered by his title. He begins by discussing the obtaining of information from other living people's minds (telepathy) or about inanimate objects (clairvoyance) in the apparent absence of normal sensory communication. He then goes on to deal with kinetic phenomena (action without normal mechanical means) and apparitions. The survey is a useful one and is clearly presented. Some of the author's interpretations of the phenomena reported are less satisfactory, and more probable explanations could be given in terms of recent theories and lines of observations in the field of normal psychology. He is hardly to be blamed for not having paid attention to these as they are still very much in the stage of active development and represent a profound change of psychological thought during the past fifteen years. Such alternative explanations would reduce the field of para-psychology but would by no means eliminate it completely. As regards survival, Dr Johnson declares himself convinced by the phenomena he surveys but mentions two points not generally realized. The first is that surveys made to gather accounts of experiences of apparitions and other similar phenomena report a substantial majority as being of living people rather than of the dead. The second is that most, and perhaps all, so-called communications with the dead could conceiv-

ably be telepathic communications with other living people or examples of clairvoyance.

Professor Firth's Frazer Lecture, unlike the other two books reviewed here, is not concerned with the validity of the belief in survival after death but with its social consequences. Early in the lecture he states his aim to be concerned with beliefs in the soul "in terms of their social functions". There would seem to be three problems here: first, in what significant ways does a belief in survival after death affect a man's social behaviour; secondly, what effects will social circumstances and pressures have upon his beliefs; and thirdly, what are the social consequences of having more than one such belief current in the same community? The first two of these are interdependent and, surely, fundamental to a discussion of the third. It is disappointing, therefore, that Professor Firth deals almost entirely with the third, and that as a result his treatment seems—if a metaphor somewhat unsuitable in this context may be permitted—to lack "body".

The important point raised both by Professor Firth's lecture and by Mr Hancock's book is that, whatever may be said or denied about survival after death, the holding of a belief in it has profound consequences both for individuals and for the communities in which they live. The effects of different types of belief and the manner in which they are formed and maintained are clearly within the field of study of the social anthropologist and the psychologist. Research within both these disciplines, even if it may never be crucial to theological issues, is likely to provide information which the theologian cannot well ignore. Certainly it would yield data of profound importance for ecclesiastical and pastoral practice.

A. T. Welford.

The Psychological Laboratory,
Cambridge.

The Virgin Mary. By Giovanni Miegge. Lutterworth Press. 21s.

The Roman Catholic cult of the Blessed Virgin invites serious consideration. Its roots are ancient; its fruits are modern; it has its own system of doctrine, its own forms of devotion, its own shrines; it exercises the piety of the faithful; it is evidenced by signs and wonders. Altogether it is a most impressive force in religious life at the present day, and its influence would, no doubt, be still more widespread but for legitimate doubts about how far it is to be identified, or even reconciled, with a true Christianity.

In this valuable study Professor Miegge traces the growth of the Marian doctrines from the 2nd century to the present day. As a member of the Waldensian Theological Faculty, the author represents a Church which has achieved co-existence with Rome not without suffering, but though his object is to damage, his methods are those of sound scholarship and fair controversy. These qualities are particularly evident in the chapter entitled "Queen of Heaven", where he refrains from drawing conclusions that have proved too

tempting for some critics. The story he has to unfold, from the Perpetual Virginity to the Co-redemptress, is long and strange, fascinating and disturbing. "In the evolution of mariological dogma," he writes, "the extremist theses are always sure to become the official theses sooner or later." These are severe words, but the author has acquired the right to use them by first showing them to be true. Although there is reason to think that the cult of the Virgin-mother has not yet reached its limit, the author understands Roman Catholicism too well to believe that the veneration of Mary can oust the worship of Christ, but he claims that the compassionate qualities of the Saviour have been transferred to the mother and that the day will come when "the real function of effectively focusing the faith and love and devotion of the masses will be exercised entirely by the Virgin Mary". The book was written in Rome. It is to be hoped that it will be read there.

Hounslow. Victor Bennett.

Jesus of Palestine. By E. F. F. Bishop. Lutterworth Press. 30s.

Mr Bishop is lecturer in Arabic at Glasgow, but from 1922–50 he was in Jerusalem, for the greater part of the time as Principal of the Newman School of Missions. Streeter once said *apropos* of some point in a seminar, "What does local colour say?" and when Mr Newman returned to Palestine, it was with the idea of finding out what fresh light Palestine and its inhabitants still have to throw on the Gospel story. He takes us through the Gospels, guided by Huck's *Synopsis*, and discusses words, phrases, customs, in the light of his intimate knowledge of Palestine and her people. Such a book is bound to be discursive, but at times we feel this one is unnecessarily so. The dreams recounted on pp. 32–6, for example, are unconvincing and give a poor start to the book. Gathering this "local colour" was Mr Bishop's hobby, not his work, and while the result would be a slight return for years of primary occupation, as pollen which the worker-bee has picked up while busy on other tasks, it is an interesting and at times very rewarding collection of facts, suggestions, memories, and linguistic parallels, which many preachers and scholars will be glad to have on their bookshelf. If your text is in the Gospels, it is probable that Mr Bishop has something to bring to it, of illumination or of warmth.

S. B. Frost.

Didsbury College.

The Story of a Beginning. By Jessie E. Higson. With a preface by the Bishop of Chichester. S.P.C.K. 15s. cloth; 7s. 6d. paper.

As one reads this account of the beginning of what is not too aptly known as Moral Welfare work in the Church of England one is sur-

prised at the great change in the climate of thought and the methods of work in less than half a century. This surprise measures up the achievement of Miss Higson, for she was the pioneer *par excellence*. Supported and encouraged by Archbishop and Mrs Davidson and Bishop Chavasse, she brought the rather hush-hush rescuing of "fallen girls" and general preventive work out into the open and linked it up with the thinking that was being directed to the relationships of men and women and with other developments in social work. Miss Higson used the experience she gained as Warden of a Refuge in Liverpool to good purpose during the First World War. At its close she was appointed to be the first Central Organizing Secretary in the Church, and that led on to the opening of the Josephine Butler House for the training of workers and her appointment as its first Warden. During this period she became more and more the adviser of the Church in regard to policy, principle and strategy; and laid a good foundation for the wide range of pastoral and educational work among men as well as women of the Moral Welfare Council as it is to-day, in which the Church of England may legitimately have pride.

As the letters she quotes extensively in the book and the paper by the late T. W. Pym in the Appendix show, she was much influenced in her thinking by others who had more theological and intellectual equipment while sharing her care and concern for people. Not everyone who has great pastoral skill also sees the necessity of sound thinking on first principles and of good techniques. It was because Miss Higson did, and because she also had a deep and strong Christian faith that she was so effective a pioneer and was able to carry the leaders of the Church with her and to get their full approval of the Church's initiative in a new field.

Miss Higson tells the story of this development in thought and social action simply and fairly. It must be gratifying to her at the end of her life to be able to write such a book, to know how well the work she began has prospered, and to be aware how sincere and abiding is the appreciation both of those she helped and of the whole Church.

LESLIE SHEFFIELD.

THE NEW MAN: CHRISTIANITY AND MAN'S COMING OF AGE. By Ronald Gregor Smith. S.C.M. Press. 10s. 6d.

THE STATUS OF MAN IN THE UNIVERSE. By Albert Van Eyken. Longmans. 7s. 6d.

CHRIST AND THE MODERN OPPORTUNITY. By Charles E. Raven. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

"The Church is her true self only when she exists for humanity"; "God is the 'beyond' in the midst of life." These two quotations from Bonhoeffer indicate the temper of Mr Ronald Gregor Smith's book and to some extent its argument. He is concerned to discover—or rather to restate, since he finds its foundations in the Bible and its

structure in the Early Church—an anthropology which is truly Christian, and which, as restated, will recognize man's coming of age and measure up to the demands of Christian evangelism and communication in contemporary society. Thomist philosophy, he argues, proved itself inadequate in its doctrine of man, and attempts to build up a structure of authority to replace the broken medieval tradition have tended to delimit spheres of interest between the sacred and the secular which make the search for a true anthropology increasingly difficult. "The Church has sought to *preserve* its message, and with the message to preserve itself. It has sought to do this by imposing itself and its message as an alien law on man's mind" (p. 55).

This implicit refusal to recognize man's coming of age in the centuries since the Renaissance has produced a deadlock. Humanist and Christian look askance at each other. The search for truth and the pursuit of being have become separated and vitiated in the loss of the true community. What is required to break out of this deadlock is "a temper and a quality of mind", rather than a new set of principles, "which will allow the world to be itself and in loving humility to elicit from the world's achievements and from its failures the possibilities which might lead it further". The remedies proposed by "archaism" (Roman Catholic or Reformed), fundamentalism and liberalism come to grief "because they are based on a partial or distorted understanding of what has been happening to man in the modern world". Bultmann, concerned with the emergence of a new possibility in man, and Bonhoeffer, in his fresh understanding of the world and God and his statement of a "this-worldly transcendence", point a way out of the deadlock. "The work which the Church does truly for God it does by being truly for men, with men, and it does its work through men. This conception of the Church's task cuts from underneath it all supposed security, all sacrosanct authority, all search for a lever of power on the world, all heteronomous ambitions. The Word of God may then be seen as being spoken in ever new forms which are created out of the experiences and enterprises of men in the actual situation where they are."

The temper of this book is critical, but compassionately critical. Its argument is more precise than these few quotations can indicate, and will be appreciated most readily by those who have read and liked some of the writings of Tillich, Buber, and J. H. Oldham.

If Mr Gregor Smith's argument can be provisionally accepted, Mr Van Eyken's book must be classified as a "heteronomous" publication. "The Roman Catholic," he says on p. 4, "has always maintained the extreme importance of humility." The Christian (p. 17) "is already persuaded of his humble condition without awaiting Copernicus, Darwin or Freud. He knows that the Copernican thesis was right but irrelevant: in later chapters it will be shown that Darwinism is relevant but wrong, and that psycho-analytic theory is often right and relevant—but only for neurotic phenomena." Humility, when wielded as a weapon in debate, tends to take the shape of a boomerang. The blurb on the cover claims that this book is "a crystallization of a Christian's reflection on the present situation in

philosophy and science"; yet there is no discussion either of logical positivism or existentialism, and some of the scientists he is most concerned to refute are the popularizers of yesteryear. It is a clever book, but Chesterton when he loosed himself on similar apologetic ventures was boisterous rather than hectoring—and perhaps thereby preserved his humility.

Dr Raven knows all about the deadlock of which Mr Gregor Smith writes, and few men in our time have done more to restate the teleological argument acceptably; to demonstrate to generations of students that it is still possible to love God with the mind; and to show "what it means to live Christianly in a sub-Christian, a non-Christian, and sometimes an anti-Christian world". These five addresses and a sermon delivered during a mission in McGill University "retain the intimacy of the spoken proclamation", and for those who can recall through them the unforgettable accents of a beloved Christian teacher this is not without value. All the passion is there—for peace, for racial justice, for true community in the Holy Spirit. Yet even among these grateful reader-listeners may be found some who look forward fretfully to a future of tape-recorded books which will doubtless contain many more sentences such as these. "Yes. Well, the new attitude towards nature, as I tried to show yesterday, is that it is all-of-a-piece."

G. H. G. Hewitt.

Sheffield.

Pallion 1874 to 1954. By C. H. G. Hopkins. Wearside Printing Co., Sunderland. 10s. 6d.

The subsidiary title of this local achievement, "Church and people in a shipyard parish", gives the clue to what the book is about. It describes the origin and growth of this important suburb of Sunderland from the days when it was a village and part of another parish. It shows how closely knit are church and people and is written from a real love of both, but for all that and a line of devoted clergy since 1874 we are left with the impression that it is a very small percentage who realize that Christianity is a supernatural religion. It looks as though the personality of the vicar counts for more than it should, though it is good to learn that in the North the personalities of the management in industry count for a great deal. The concluding chapter is a mine of good sense concerning the parochial system as it is to-day, and should be included in all ordinands' pastoralia courses.

Ian R. Carrick, O.G.S.

Northolt Park.

THE SONG OF TRANQUEBAR. By J. Sandegren. Christian Literature Society. 12 annas.

A MEMOIR OF WILLIAM EDMUND SMYTH. By T. R. Teague. S.P.C.K. 5s.

THE CAMBRIDGE SEVEN. By J. C. Pollock. I.V.F. 3s. 6d.

THE GROWTH OF THE WORLD CHURCH. By E. A. Payne. Macmillan. 2s. 6d.

THE BRIDGES OF GOD. By D. A. McGavran. World Dominion Press. 7s. 6d.

TOWARDS A THEOLOGY OF MISSION. By W. Andersen. S.C.M. Press. 3s.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AND ISLAM IN WEST AFRICA. By J. S. Trimingham. S.C.M. Press. 3s.

THE CONFLICT OF RELIGIONS. By P. H. Ashby. Scribner's. $3.50.

Bishop Sandegren's *Song of Tranquebar* has the modest subtitle: "Some notes on the story of the mission at Tranquebar written for the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary celebrations 1706–1956." It is a simple, factual account, admirably free from bombast. It is attractively illustrated, the romantic photograph of the old Danish fort in particular inciting in me to a strong desire to pack my bags at once and visit the place.

The *Memoir of William Edmund Smyth*, on the other hand, may appeal only to his intimate friends. Others may be irritated, less perhaps by the misprints, which begin on pp. 13 and 14, than by the irrelevant details. Need we know that at Bishop Smyth's consecration "the Metropolitan wore a cope and mitre of cloth of gold"? Many of the letters, in particular the final three pages of obituary letters, add nothing to the story. This is a pity. For the saintliness of the subject and the author's obvious devotion to him might have produced a book more attractive to the general reader.

The Cambridge Seven is at the other end of the ecclesiastical scale. Again the reader may be irritated by the presentation as a "success story" or, more likely, by the emphasis on the wealth, social class and athletic prowess of the subjects. But let's stop being irritated. To enjoy this book we politically pale pink parsons who played only for our college, must accept the fact that "in the early eighties wealth and position could command a respect untinged by bitterness, while the testimony of the greatest all-round cricketer in England, supported by a prominent oarsman, could impress where other men's words fell flat" (pp. 95 f.). That granted, we can rejoice at the story of how God raised up these young men.

The Growth of the World Church is remarkably cheap at the price. Its concentration on the Free Church contribution will be a valuable corrective to many Anglican readers. They may, however, notice that less than their two hundred and fifty years is credited to the S.P.C.K. and S.P.G. (p. 25). More intentional, according to the foreword, is the neglect of Roman Catholic Missions. Indeed, the most striking reference to them is in William Shrubsole's hymn, "Break super-

stition's papal chain" (p. 84). This lack of balance makes the title somewhat misleading.

As might most of us, Dr Payne rejoices in the fact that in the 19th century "entry into the Church was in most areas an individual rather than a group decision" (p. 137). Dr McGavran might dispute this joy. He is a reformer, practical as befits an experienced missionary, but radical. In *The Bridges of God* he distinguishes between what he calls the "Mission Station Approach" and "People Movements". His rapid survey of Church history from its beginnings confirms his conviction that to concentrate on the conversion of social and ethnical groups entire is the key to successful evangelism. We must divert our main missionary effort to "People Movements" wherever they occur, away from "Mission Stations". The "Mission Station Approach" was an expedient. The Western missionaries in the 19th century had no social or cultural ties with the Asiatic or African masses. They had to work on individuals, drawing them out of their social milieu into the mission compound. Now that method was out of date.

Dr McGavran does not quite explain how the "Mission Station Approach", which he so courteously attacks, was yet characteristic of the great age of missionary expansion. He would probably eagerly agree to the need of more research on his assumptions.

Towards a Theology of Mission might help us here. Dr Andersen is as clear as Dr McGavran that "missionary activity does not consist in the spreading abroad of certain religious or even Christian ideas or convictions. . . . Its one purpose is to turn men into members of the Church of Christ, and to win them for the Kingdom of God" (p. 22). But readers outside the inner ecumenical councils may find themselves uncertain just what his book is about, what points he wishes to make, unless it be the obvious one that we must think theologically (and eschatologically) about missions. There is some interesting criticism of Anglican incarnational theology towards the end.

Mr Trimingham's book, also an I.M.C. Research Pamphlet, is naturally more specific. Whether independently, or as a member of the same school of thought, he confirms Dr McGavran's thesis at several points. He cannot rejoice that "Christianity has stressed individual conversion, which is without meaning for a pagan, but it has not in its outreach into Africa had a message for the community" (pp. 27 f.). Like Dr McGavran he deplores the fact that "so absorbed are most missionaries in institutional work, that they can do little to arouse the Church to the need for wider witness" (p. 28). With Dr McGavran he asks: "Should we not be ready to baptize a whole family or village which is prepared to acknowledge Christ as Saviour?" (p. 48). "The confrontation of pagans or Muslims in community with the Gospel seems to (him) to be impossible until they have become nominal Christians."

Dr Ashby's plea for "fruitful interchange" between Christian and Muslim thinkers would appeal to Mr Trimingham. In a learned and humane book Dr Ashby analyses the spiritual tensions within and

between Christianity, Islam, Hinduism and Buddhism respectively. He wisely does not minimize their radical differences. For him "the assumption that all religions are ultimately the same" (p. 213) is mistaken. He distinguishes three possible Christian attitudes to other religions in terms of "Radical Displacement, Syncretism, and Fulfilment". But he recognizes the first as most characteristic. So we are disposed to accept his plea for "co-operation without compromise" (p. 196) as based on a realistic analysis. But for him this means "common worship and spiritual fellowship". But how can Christians or Muslims worship with others? The Indian Government's basic education program provides for a daily period of "undenominational" worship. The Moderator of the Church of South India has issued a statement explaining why Christians cannot conscientiously take part. For all his humane learning, Dr Ashby cannot persuade us that he was wrong to do so.

A. H. Dammers.

Palamcottah,
S. India.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

Aubier: René Marlé, S.J., *Bultmann et l'Interprétation du Nouveau Testament* (600 frs).

Batsford: E. W. Heaton, *Everyday Life in Old Testament Times* (15s.).

A. and C. Black (Dacre Press): L. S. Thornton, *Christ and the Church* (18s.).

Blackfriars: St Thomas Aquinas, *The Blessed Sacrament and the Mass* (10s. 6d.).

Hodder and Stoughton: C. F. D. Moule, *The Sacrifice of Christ* (3s. 6d.).

Inter-Varsity Fellowship: A. J. Dain, *Mission Fields To-day* (4s.).

Michael Joseph: Karl Stern, *The Third Revolution* (15s.).

Longmans: E. L. Mascall, *Christian Theology and Natural Science* (25s.); John M. Todd, *Catholicism and the Ecumenical Movement* (6s. 6d.); A. M. Ramsey, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church* [reviewed by A. G. Hebert, S.S.M., in Theology, May 1936, pp. 307 ff.; this new edition is a welcome reprint with a few omissions and additions] (15s.).

Rockliff: Peter Hammond, *The Waters of Marah* (21s.).

Routledge and Kegan Paul: Erich Fromm, *The Sane Society* (25s.).

Royal School of Church Music: Horace Spence, *Decently and in Order* (3s.).

S.C.M. Press: Neville Clark, *An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments* (8s.).

Society for O.T. Study (Llansadwrn, Menai Bridge, Anglesey): *Book List* 1956 [valuable bibliography of books on O.T. subjects, with short notices about each] (6s.).

S.P.C.K.: George Every, S.S.M., *The High Church Party 1688–1718* (30s.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LTD.
GUILDFORD AND LONDON

S · P · C · K

FILM AND FILMSTRIP SERVICE

FILMSTRIPS

Filmstrips, projectors and screens are available for hire from all branches of S.P.C.K.

A copy of the *S.P.C.K. Filmstrip Guide* will be sent, free of charge, on application to an S.P.C.K. bookshop.

FILMS

For all film bookings apply to S.P.C.K. Film Department, Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2

Copies of the *S.P.C.K. Film Guide* are obtainable free on request.

S · P · C · K

S · P · C · K

THE FAITH AND MODERN ERROR

Harry Blamires **15s. net**

"Mr Blamires' purpose is analytical, and is to warn us against paying an undue deference to the contemporary intellectual situation. . . . An exciting and a very well written book which says really important things."

Canon Roger Lloyd in the Manchester Guardian

ROME'S DENIALS OF ANGLICAN ORDERS

H. Burn-Murdoch **1s.**

Dr Burn-Murdoch provides a complete and concise reply to the familiar Roman contentions. Clearly and simply he gives Anglican objections to Roman theories.

*DEAN COLET AND HIS THEOLOGY

E. W. Hunt **30s. net**

"The work has the supreme merit of being based on a thorough study of Colet's writings in the original Latin. . . . The section on Colet's mysticism is particularly notable, because it breaks new ground."

Church Times

*THE HIGH CHURCH PARTY

1688-1718

George Every, S.S.M. **30s. net**

"Brother Every's Book is a detailed and fully documented history of the party. It demonstrates the debt of Anglicanism and indeed the nation as a whole in these years to the High Churchmen."

Canon Addleshaw in View-Review

**Published for the Church Historical Society.*